

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully point out that the restriction requirement is in error. Thus, the restriction requirement divides the subject matter of claims 1-16 into four groups. However, Applicants point out that the Preliminary Amendment filed July 7, 2005, cancels claims 1-16 in favor of new claims 17-55, which the Examiner does not group or otherwise mention in the restriction requirement. Applicants have checked and the Preliminary Amendment is in the image filewrapper in public PAIR. Consequently, the Preliminary Amendment is of record and should have been taken into account in formulating the restriction requirement.

Applicants attempted to reply to the restriction requirement based on what the groupings should look like if the claims in the preliminary amendment were taken into account (and the undersigned left the Examiner a voicemail to that effect). However, it proved to be impossible as it was not clear to Applicants how claims 53-55 would be grouped or some of the other claims as well.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a new restriction requirement taking into consideration the claims in the Preliminary Amendment.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By /Kurt G. Briscoe/
Kurt G. Briscoe
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 33,141
875 Third Avenue - 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 808-0700
Fax: (212) 808-0844